



# Meeting Notes

## Landscape Focus Group Meeting

**9:00 a.m. – Tuesday, June 23, 2009**

APS Conference Room, 101 West Cherry Ave, Flagstaff, AZ

1. Welcome and Introductions

Meeting was called to order by Chair Gary Nelson at 9:00 a.m.

In attendance:

Ed Larsen, City of Flagstaff  
Craig Watkins  
Nigel Sparks  
Elaine Averitt, City of Flagstaff  
Ellen Ryan  
Gary Nelson  
Melinda Klatzker  
Cheryl Edgar  
Randy Groth, City of Flagstaff  
Terra Crampton  
Jeff Stein  
Kim Tittelbaugh  
Michael Leary  
Roger Eastman  
Amy Sinsheimer  
Lisa Wise

2. Overview of Transect Planning was presented by Roger Eastman and a video was viewed by the Group.

3. Elaine Averitt provided a presentation on landscaping for a commercial parking lot in Flagstaff with an overview of the standards required for landscaping of parkways. She also provided calculations for the number of plants units required.

4. Discussion: Comments by the Group were:

- Need for consistency of street trees from one project to another, as well as other landscaping (shrubs, etc.)
- Landscape pallet should vary for different areas based on natural landscape conditions (e.g. presence of ponderosa pines) and local micro-climates.
- Need to open up the existing landscape palette originally created by the Arboretum to provide more diversity and more sustainability
- Keep variety as an option with a common thread based on local areas. But be careful of not limiting the plant palette in higher T-zones

- Other types of plants should be integrated to make the community more interesting. A native and non-native mix is appropriate.
- Other elements such as ground cover materials (rocks, stones, etc.) should be added into the code
- Requiring the planning of local grasses may cause a concern to the City Parks Dept. from a maintenance perspective
- We need a landscape code that is a tool for designers – promote diversity, character and form. There needs to be a balance between ensuring minimum standards are met and encouraging the planting of more landscape materials. Consider new criteria and incentives for flexibility.
- Move section 19 from the Engineering Standards and put into the landscape section of the zoning code.
- Need to make Code more user-friendly and simple
- Problem with going in a new direction with old standards
- Table 10-06-002-0003 – consider an Option D to the Plant Unit Alternatives based on the use of the site. E.g. for an auto dealer have less of a need for buffer yard screening on the frontage (lower plant height) and perhaps more between dealers.
- Opacity requirements as currently written limit flexibility
- Create more diversity in the plant unit alternatives – look at long term needs.
- Table 10-06-002-0003 consider this as “landscape unit alternatives” rather than “plant unit alternatives”
- Promote diversity in landscaping and not settle for compromises
- Allow more freedom with guidelines for landscape design
- Need to add appropriate ground cover and flowering plants
- Incorporate LID standards into Landscape code
- More flexible standard for native species based on availability. “Sustainability realistically means delayed gratification.”
- Consider areas for food production as part of the requirement for landscaping.
- Develop landscape standards for conventional zones and transect zones.
- Design guidelines to see whether they are guidelines or code before the next meeting.
- A sub-committee would be formed to review the landscape plant palette - will be composed of: Dan Anderson, Pam Symond, Nigel Sparks, Michael O’Leary, Jeff Stein and Randy Groth.

5. Next Meeting: July 14, 2009 at 9:00 a.m.

6. Adjournment: 10:30 a.m.